

The Search for New Physics

What can VV interactions tell us?

S. Dawson, BNL
October 30, 2014




S. Dawson

Thanks


- *Thanks to Linda Feierabend for the superb organization*
- Thanks to all the speakers for such interesting talks
- Thanks to Marc-Andre Pleier for the great program

*Apologies.....this is a selection of results which
caught my fancy....no priorities implied*

LHC Cross sections are close to SM




At a generic level, data and theory in excellent agreement for many different processes



We discovered a Higgs boson!

- The minimal Higgs model is very predictive
- Only free parameter is M_H





CMS

Decay	Expected	Observed
ZZ	7.1σ	6.7σ
$\gamma\gamma$	3.9σ	3.2σ
WW	5.3σ	3.9σ
bb	2.2σ	2.1σ
$\tau\tau$	2.6σ	2.8σ

Both ATLAS and CMS have close to 10σ significance

Precision Physics After Higgs Discovery



The SM as an effective low energy theory
is an extremely good approximation

But the SM can't be complete

- It doesn't explain:
 - Neutrino masses
 - Dark matter
 - Baryon asymmetry
 - The pattern of fermion masses

If new physics explains any of this, how do we get a handle on the relevant energy scale?

Vector boson self interactions are a good place to look for BSM physics and test our understanding of QCD


Deviations from SM

- We already know they must be small!
 - But we expect deviations $\sim v^2/(\text{TeV})^2$
 - Just starting to explore interesting region
- Need to hone our tools for precise predictions and measurements


Gauge boson self interactions play a special role

VV Pair Production

- Cancellations between contributions





Large cancellations spoiled
if γWW and ZWW vertices
not *exactly* SM



- * Exactly the same physics in $pp \rightarrow W^+W^-$, but PDFs come in

VV Scattering



$$A \approx g^2 \frac{E^2}{M_W^2}$$

$$A \approx -g^2 \frac{E^2}{M_W^2}$$

E^4 terms cancel
between TGC and QGC

Terms which grow
with energy cancel for
 $E \gg M_H$

This cancellation requires
 $M_H < 800$ GeV

SM particles have just the right couplings so amplitudes don't grow with energy

BSM Physics with EFT

- Add higher order contributions

$$L \sim L_{SM} + \sum_i \frac{C_i}{\Lambda^{n-4}} O_n$$

- O_n constructed to obey all symmetries of theory
- Weakly interacting theories, SM loops same size as leading EFT operators
- No unique operator parameterization
- Equations of motion relate operators
 - Most useful basis depends on process
 - Generically EFT operators give effects $O(s/\Lambda^2)$

[Reuter, Sekula]


Where is EFT Valid?

- Specific models for BSM physics theoretically well behaved
 - But have to do analysis for each model
- If no new light particles, an effective Lagrangian can be used
 - Approach fails if kinematic variables are near resonances
 - *Valid at scales much below all new physics, $E \ll \Lambda$*
 - Approach violates unitarity at some scale
 - Form factors can cure unitarity violation, but violate gauge invariance

Kilian: EFTs tend to have larger region of validity for TGCs than for QGCs


BSM VB Scattering: W^+W^+jj

- New physics effects grow like s/Λ^2 , spoil cancellations
- Unitarity violation above red band (region of validity)



Note growth of EFT
effects with M_{WW}

[Kilian]



Unitarization


Kilian, Ohl, Reuter,
Sekulla, arXiv:1408.6207

Higgs \leftrightarrow VV interactions


- Higgs and VV interactions related in EFTs

$$O_W = (D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger W^{\mu\nu} D_\nu \phi$$


$$O_B = (D_\mu \phi)^\dagger B^{\mu\nu} D_\nu \phi$$



$$i \frac{g m_W}{\Lambda^2} \left\{ \frac{f_W}{2} [k_1^\alpha k_1^\beta + k_2^\alpha k_2^\beta] - g^{\alpha\beta} (k_1^2 + k_2^2) \right\} + \\ (f_W - 2f_{WW}) [k_2^\alpha k_1^\beta - g^{\alpha\beta} (k_1 \cdot k_2)]$$



$$i \frac{g^2 m_W^2}{\Lambda^2 c} f_W [g^{\alpha\gamma} g^{\beta\rho} + g^{\alpha\rho} g^{\beta\gamma} - 2g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\gamma\rho}]$$



$$i \frac{gs}{2\Lambda^2} \left\{ m_W^2 (f_B + f_W) [g^{\alpha\beta} k_1^\gamma - g^{\alpha\gamma} k_1^\beta] + \right. \\ - 3g^2 f_{WWW} \left[k_1^\beta k_2^\gamma k_3^\alpha - k_1^\gamma k_2^\alpha k_3^\beta + (k_1 \cdot k_2) (g^{\alpha\gamma} k_3^\beta - g^{\beta\gamma} k_3^\alpha) + \right. \\ \left. \left. (k_1 \cdot k_3) (g^{\beta\gamma} k_2^\alpha - g^{\alpha\beta} k_2^\gamma) + (k_2 \cdot k_3) (g^{\alpha\beta} k_1^\gamma - g^{\alpha\gamma} k_1^\beta) \right] \right\}$$


[Reuter]

S. Dawson

14

Example

$$\frac{\Gamma(H \rightarrow W^+W^-)}{\Gamma(H \rightarrow W^+W^-)_{SM}} \sim 1 + \left[.0086 f_{WW}(m_Z) + .017 f_W(m_Z) \right] \left(\frac{1 \text{ TeV}}{\Lambda} \right)^2$$



In principle, complementary data from oblique parameters and Higgs data


Interconnections

- Important to do **global fits**
- W^+W^- production probes **complementary** coupling space to Higgs coupling limits

$$\Delta\kappa_\gamma = \frac{M_W^2}{2\Lambda^2} (f_W + f_B)$$

$$\Delta g_1^Z = \frac{M_Z^2}{2\Lambda^2} f_W$$


Limits on a single operator from a single process can be misleading



Corbett et al, arXiv:1304.1151



Dibosons

- $W\gamma, Z\gamma, WW, WZ, ZZ$
 - QCD effects are large
 - Often requires NNLO, resummation
 - *Tools provided by theorists not complete!*
 - Sensitive to new physics
 - Backgrounds to Higgs Measurements



ZZ Production

- Rates in good agreement with NLO




[Wu (ATLAS)]

ZZ looks SM-like

\sqrt{s} [TeV]	σ_{LO} [pb]	σ_{NLO} [pb]	σ_{NNLO} [pb]
7	$4.172^{+0.7\%}_{-1.6\%}$	$6.049^{+2.8\%}_{-2.2\%}$	$6.747^{+2.9\%}_{-2.3\%}$
8	$5.066^{+2.7\%}_{-1.6\%}$	$7.376^{+2.8\%}_{-2.3\%}$	$8.294^{+3.0\%}_{-2.3\%}$

NNLO the standard

Always the last bin for anomalous couplings




[Channon (CMS), Kallweit]

S. Dawson

19

ZZ and Higgs Width

- $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ receives contributions from $gg \rightarrow H$
 - Amplitude behaves differently on peak and above peak




CMS: $\Gamma_H < 5.4 \Gamma_{H,\text{SM}}$
ATLAS: $\Gamma_H < 4.8\text{-}7.7 \Gamma_{H,\text{SM}}$


Campbell, Ellis, Williams, arXiv: 1311.3589

[Ellis]

WW Production



Last bin effect




2 σ higher than NLO
SM prediction

[Wu (ATLAS), Parker (Tevatron)]

NNLO WW Production


\sqrt{s} [TeV]	σ_{LO} [pb]	σ_{NLO} [pb]	σ_{NNLO} [pb]	$\sigma_{\text{gg} \rightarrow \text{H} \rightarrow \text{WW}^*}$ [pb]
7	$29.52^{+1.6\%}_{-2.5\%}$	$45.16^{+3.7\%}_{-2.9\%}$	$49.04^{+2.1\%}_{-1.8\%}$	$3.25^{+7.1\%}_{-7.8\%}$
8	$35.50^{+2.4\%}_{-3.5\%}$	$54.77^{+3.7\%}_{-2.9\%}$	$59.84^{+2.2\%}_{-1.9\%}$	$4.14^{+7.2\%}_{-7.8\%}$

ATLAS 2 σ excess
reduced by NNLO
contributions





WW Production

- Information in distributions
- Is slight excess at peak BSM or QCD?





Dawson, Lewis, Zeng, arXiv:1307.3249

[Lewis, Meade]





Meade, Ramani, Zeng, arXiv:1407.4481

Jet Veto and WW Production



VBS Zjj Production





Important for modeling
VBF Higgs production;
understanding of VBF cuts

- 1% of strong Zjj rate
- Large rapidity gap,
large M_{jj}
- Experiment: Complicated MC
modeling of Zjj events
- Theory: need better understanding of
interference effects

[Pilkington (ATLAS), Wen (CMS)]


Zjj at 8 TeV



ATLAS & CMS both have 5σ observation of EW Zjj signal




[Pilkington (ATLAS), Wen (CMS)]

VVjj Production



Theory: VBFNLO (fixed order QCD)
for ZZjj, WWjj, WZjj

VBF cuts separate QCD and EW contributions very efficiently





NLO Theory

[Karlberg, Liu (ATLAS)]

W⁺W⁺jj Production



- W⁺W⁺ production suppresses QCD contributions
 - Sensitivity to quartic gauge interactions



2 σ observation of EW WWjj in both experiments

[Lopes de Sal (CMS), Liu (ATLAS)]

$\gamma\gamma$ production




Even at NNLO still an excess
in data at low $\Delta\phi$


[Channon(CMS)]

Z γ

	LO	NLO	NNLO	experiment
ATLAS setup $p_T^\gamma > 15 \text{ GeV}$	$0.8507[2]^{+7\%}_{-9\%} \text{ pb}$	$1.2262[4]^{+4\%}_{-5\%} \text{ pb}$	$1.305[3]^{+1\%}_{-2\%} \text{ pb}$	$1.310 \pm .020(\text{stat}) \pm .110(\text{syst}) \pm .050(\text{lumi}) \text{ pb}$



Agrees with NNLO
even at large p_T^γ




[Channon(CMS), Kallweit]

To unitarize or not to unitarize?

- As a theorist, I want results which I can interpret in terms of my favorite BSM model and use to test QCD calculations
- As soon as you find a signal in the last bin and measure an anomalous coupling, theorists will build models to explain it

CMS $Z\gamma$ anomalous coupling



$\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ is un-unitarized bound


[Channon (CMS)]

S. Dawson


31

Tribosons

- Tribosons are background to HV, $t\bar{t}V$, SUSY searches




Signal strength
 $3.7^{+1.9}_{-2.1}$ times SM



[Neugen(ATLAS)]

Triboson Results

- Limits on $WV\gamma$ production
 - Sensitive to $WW\gamma$, ZWW , $WWV\gamma$ vertices
 - Really small SM rate!
 - Look for enhancement at high p_T (just where EFT is breaking down, and problems with unitarity)
 - $WW\gamma\gamma$ dimension-8 operator limits
 - $|a_0^W/\Lambda^2| < 20 \text{ TeV}^{-2}$ (CMS)
 - $|a_0^W/\Lambda^2| < 5 \text{ TeV}^{-2}$ (D0)



[Faulkner(CMS), Parker(Tevatron)]

Large increase in Rates at 14 TeV

8 TeV	ZZ	WZ	WW	$Z(\rightarrow \ell\ell)\gamma$	$W(\rightarrow \ell\nu)\gamma$	$\gamma\gamma$
σ_{LO} (pb)	5.06	12.94	35.56	9.23	45.39	43.01
σ_{NLO} (pb)	$7.92^{+4.7\%}_{-3.0\%}$	$22.88^{+7.5\%}_{-5.7\%}$	$57.25^{+4.1\%}_{-2.8\%}$	$11.48^{+3.5\%}_{-5.1\%}$	$59.7^{+6\%}_{-9\%}$	$55.8^{+4\%}_{-6\%}$
14 TeV	ZZ	WZ	WW	$Z(\rightarrow \ell\ell)\gamma$	$W(\rightarrow \ell\nu)\gamma$	$\gamma\gamma$
σ_{LO} (pb)	10.92	27.55	74.48	17.97	85.8	88.76
σ_{NLO} (pb)	$17.72^{+3.5\%}_{-2.5\%}$	$51.82^{+5.5\%}_{-4.3\%}$	$124.31^{+2.8\%}_{-2.0\%}$	$21.20^{+3.7\%}_{-6.6\%}$	$110.2^{+6\%}_{-12\%}$	$108.1^{+3\%}_{-5\%}$

Conclusions

- The study of gauge boson interactions at the LHC is
 - Good predictions for cross sections of VV , Vjj , $VVjj$, VVV (up to NNLO/NNLO)
 - Theorists have worked hard to turn these results into tools for experiments
 - Rates increase significantly at 13 TeV
 - Limits on effective field theories parameterized by physics
 - Interesting theory issues in interpreting limits
- 